DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 540 CS 205 018

AUTHOR Ferguson, Mary Ann
TITLE Some Empirically-Generated Public Relations Roles and Associations with Various Descriptive Variables.
PUB DATE Aug 79
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (62nd, Houston, Texas, August 5-8, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Patterns; Communication (Thought Transfer); *Job Analysis; Job Skills; *Occupational Information; *Occupational Surveys; *Public Relations; *Role Perception

ABSTRACT

Eight public relations specialization roles were developed from a survey of members of the Public Relations Society of America. The roles are: problem solver manager, journalist/technical communicator, researcher, staff manager, good will ambassador, meeting organizer, personnel/industrial relations manager, and public/community relations developer. Several descriptive variables were associated with these roles. Those who worked in public relations agencies tended to indicate that a problem solver/manager role was most appropriate for themselves, while those in nonagency organizations tended to indicate that a journalist/technical communicator role or a good will ambassador role was most appropriate. Females tended to indicate that they saw their roles as journalist/technical communicator, good will ambassador, or meeting organizer. The older the practitioners the more likely they were to indicate a public/community relations role as appropriate. The more experience in public relations, the more the practitioners saw themselves as problem solver/managers. The higher the salary of practitioners and the level of their education, the less likely they were to indicate that a journalist/technical communicator, good will ambassador, or a meeting organizer role was appropriate for themselves. (Author/FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED177540

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Public Relations Division

SOME EMPIRICALLY-GENERATED PUBLIC RELATIONS ROLES AND ASSOCIATIONS WITH VARIOUS DESCRIPTIVE VARIABLES

BY

Mary Ann Ferguson
Graduate Student

School of Journalism and Mass Communication
Univeristy of Wisconsin-Madison
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
608-263-3066

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary Ann Ferguson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS205018

Paper presented to the Public Relations Division, Association for Education in Journalism Annual Convention, Houston, Texas, August, 1979.

This study was done as part of the author's masters thesis and the data were collected by the author and graduate student Rose Lyn Jacob.

Studies of public relations practitioners typically report findings indicating the frequency with which practitioners engage in various activities or duties.[1] Little attention is paid, however, to determining whether these activities are practiced universally or only by certain practitioners in certain situations. Center (1977) begins to explore such delineation by noting that the relative "importance" for the public relations functions differs for different categories of practitioners, "For example, only those departments in nonprofit hospitals or private schools, or only those corporations with more than $1 billion in business."[2]

The underlying assumption made by these studies continues to prevail--all practitioners generally engage in similar duties or activities, although the emphasis or order of importance may change. This assumption ignores the possibility that many practitioners never engage in most of the activities; they are specialists and act in very restricted public relations roles. Hill (1976) points us in just such a direction. He reports a trend in large corporations toward public relations departments,

> . . . organized and structured and manned with specialists in such fields as press relations, communications, research, stockholder and financial relations, product promotion, employee communications, and--of great importance--government relations.[3]

The head of this department is the policy management practitioner. Hill says this individual participates in management policy decisions and explains the public's views and expectations to management, and management's decisions to the public.

This specialist versus generalist issue will be addressed by this research. The primary question asks whether practitioners tend to operate primarily in specialist roles, and if so, what behaviors or activities are associated with these roles. In addition, the research is concerned with the question of what other attributes, such as age, experience, or type of organization might be associated with particular specializations.

The Public Relations Role as a Concept

The concept "role" has its origins in drama concepts and as such refers to the part an actor plays. Its origins as a social science concept are not so clear. Popitz (1972) says Linton formulated the role concept in his Study of Man (1936).[4] Jackson (1972), however, argues that Cooley's (1902) notion of the looking-glass self and Mead's (1934) Mind, Self and Society were at least one strand in the development of the tradition of role theory.[5]

In the social sciences the concept is used both to refer to actual behavior, and to a particular attitude, i.e., taking the attitude of the other. The definition centers around what a person is supposed to do because of the social position or office he holds (Coutu, 1951),[6] and the normative expectations held by others for the performance of a particular person in a position (Parsons, 1951)[7]. Turner (1956) suggests that a role is,

> . . . a collection of patterns of behaviors which are thought to constitute a meaningful unit and deemed appropriate to a person occupying a particular status in society . . .[8]

Others have added a comparison unit to the definition; role refers to a cluster of behavioral norms which a certain category of society or a group

has to fulfill in comparison with others (Popitz, 1972).[9] As is apparent in these definitions, the role concept has a dual nature. It can refer to both actual and ideal behavior, as well as to the expectations of the role occupant and those of some larger society.

The definition adopted for this research does not assume that there is only one public relations role, it leaves open who can hold the norms or expectations, and it could refer to either ideal or actual behaviors, or to both. For the purposes of this research, a public relations role is defined as the pattern of behaviors which constitute a meaningful unit, and are expected of and considered appropriate for public relations practitioners. This definition allows for exploration of role norms in terms of the office holder's expectations, in terms of those the office holder interacts with--other members of his role set--or in terms of a particular subset of society.

From this definition determining a public relations role requires locating patterns of behaviors which are considered meaningful and appropriate for or to practitioners. These expectations could come from members of the practitioner's role set: his peers, his superiors, his subordinates, members of the media, various publics, or from the practitioner himself. If, for example, the group whose norms were under consideration believed that appropriate behaviors for practitioners were publicity-generating activities, then, in this group's view, this would be the public relations role.

Public Relations Behaviors and Activities

Determining potential behaviors of practitioners required locating a relatively large universe of behaviors usually attributed to practitioners.

It was recognized that this universe might differ depending upon the group whose norms were under study, or depending whether we were concerned with actual or ideal behaviors. Because the research question centers on the practitioner and both ideal and actual behaviors, the search was limited to sources which might reflect the practitioner's perspective. It appeared that with these boundaries more than one type of source was appropriate. Public relations definitions would give some clues to how practitioners were expected to act, as least in the view of those constructing the definitions. The other logical source was surveys of practitioners. From this source we would expect to learn how practitioners report they generally behave in the practice of public relations.

Definitions of public relations were scanned to locate phrases and terms indicating behaviors expected of practitioners. Management-related activities turned up in most of the definitions (Harlow, 1976). These activities included keeping management informed and involved, defining and emphasizing the responsibility of management, and keeping management abreast of change and trends.[10] The other element which emerged in these definitions was a research component. Lerbinger (1977) maintains that this element is fast becoming a part of the practitioner's management-like approach.[11]

In addition to using definitons to provide clues to practitioner's duties, survey reports were scanned. Particularly useful were Cutlip and Center's (1978) report of surveys conducted by the Education Committee of PRSA, and their own surveys of public relations departments in businesses, associations, societies, unions, and non-profit organizations.[12] These surveys

and definitions turned up more than 80 separate activities which were considered appropriate by some for practitioners.

The extensiveness of these lists indicated that some form of item reduction was necessary, particularly in terms of the numerous media production activities. Items on the list included: preparing exhibits, preparing displays, preparing posters, preparing art, producing brochures, writing pamphlets, producing manuals, and writing and editing handbooks. In an attempt to reduce the number of items, a secondary analysis was performed on data gathered from more than 1,000 business communicators for the International Association of Business Communicators by the Communication Research Center at the S.I. Newhouse School of Public Communication.[13]

The 32 items asking about the types of media produced were examined and any relatively high associations noted. Based on these associations, reductions and combinations reduced the original 80 plus items to 45. Items combined included: producing brochures, pamphlets, manuals and handbooks; conducting meetings and conferences; preparing exhibits, displays, posters, and art; preparing annual reports and financial reports; organizing meetings, special events and conferences; and producing video cassettes, recordings and slides. It was recognized that because of the nature of this sample (business communicators rather than public relations practitioners), some of the associations noted in the IABC data might not exist for public relations practitioners. The need to reduce the number of items to a more manageable set, however, outweighed this concern. It was felt that the items which were combined were similar enough to warrant reduction without serious threat to the validity of the roles to be developed.

Although this list of activities is not considered to be all-inclusive, it does include most of the activities noted in surveys of practitioners, and most of the functions noted in the definitions. As such it probably includes most of the wide range of activities public relations practitioners engage in or would expect to engage in. It is argued that most practitioners could describe their roles in terms of some subset of these items, and hence these items represent a fair universe of public relations activities or duties.

Hypotheses

Because of the exploratory nature of this research, it was difficult, but certainly not impossible, to develop hypotheses based upon past research evidence. Data from other studies had the potential to provide some clues to preliminary hypotheses about practitioner's roles. Several studies were examined, but unfortunately most simply asked practitioners if they engaged in a particular activity, or whether a particular function was considered important. This bi-modal level of analysis generally was not adaptable to the research question of specialization or generalization. The IABC study, however, offered some possibilities. The questionnaire had sixteen items asking repondents about the amount of time they spent in each of the activities scaled from a little or none, to most. These items were submitted to factor analysis. The analysis produced five factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0:

Factor 1 - Arranging meeting, conducting meetings, and personnel/industrial relations.

Factor 2 - Advertising, and marketing/sales/sales promotion.

Factor 3 - Publicity/public relations, and community relations.

Factor 4 - Producing films/slide shows, etc., and closed-circuit TV.

Factor 5 - Photography and writing/editing for publications.

The other five items loaded on more than one factor. In developing the hypotheses from these factors, caution was necessary. These factors represented time spent, not the appropriateness of the activity. Also, this survey left out many of the activities usually associated with a management or problem-solving approach to public relations. It does not include activities such as developing and assessing alternative solutions or those associated with audience identification. It also ignores press relations and production of news releases. It does not include any of the research items some are now associating with public relations and it leaves out activities related to representing or lobbying for employers. Finally, as mentioned earlier, these respondents are not just public relations practitioners. Rather this group includes many who consider themselves marketing or advertising professionals.

Within these cautions, and with consideration for the emphasis on various activities in public relations definitions, six public relations roles were hypothesized. Because of the great emphasis in public relations definitions on the management function, it was hypothesized that this would be the role most often considered appropriate by practitioners. This role was expected to include general problem-solving behaviors such as analyzing facts, planning programs, developing alternative solutions, and other management-related activities such as the daily program management, and managing, training and recruiting of staff.

The second role was expected to be primarily a journalistic-type role. Although this was the fifth factor in the IABC data, the close ties between journalism and public relations, and the relative importance most surveys attach to these activities would suggest that this role is considered an appropriate one by many practitioners. It was expected that this role would include such activities as: writing news releases, editing, photography, and maintaining press relations.

No hypotheses are offered about the order of the other four roles. One hypothesized role was expected to be a research role. It was expected to include such activities as: conducting opinion research surveys, fact-finding, communication audits, and preparing research proposals. Another expected role was an advertising-marketing type function. Based upon the moderate loadings noted in the IABC data, this role should include such activities as preparing exhibits, displays, posters and art.

In the IABC data it was found that journalistic-type activities were not highly correlated with the more technical activities of film and slide show production, and closed-circuit TV. Based upon this, it was expected that a technical communicator role would emerge. This role was expected to include such behaviors as: producing brochures, pamphlets, manuals; preparing graphics; producing video cassettes, recordings; producing house publications; and writing speeches.

The post-hoc analysis of the IABC data also led to expectation of a public-community relations role. Behaviors which were thought to make up this role were: representing employer, being a good-will ambassador, developing community relations, and maintaining contact with public officials.

In summary, it was hypothesized that public relations practitioners would consider six different roles appropriate for themselves: management-problem solving, journalist, research, technical communicator, advertising-marketing, and public-community relations. The only order postulated was that the management-problem solving role and the journalist role would be first and second, respectively.

Methodology

The instrument developed asked practitioners how appropriate or proper the 45 activities drawn from the surveys and definitions were for themselves in their current positions. A pretest was conducted with 25 participants at the Midwest Public Relations Conference, September, 1978. As a result of this pretest, some items were slightly modified to clear up confusion.

A systematic random sample of 250 members of the Public Relations Society of America was drawn from the 1978 membership roster. A larger sample would have ensured more confidence in the generalizability of the findings, but because the survey was conducted and funded by the author and another graduate student, financial considerations restricted the sample size.

The questionnaire was a two-page (both sides) legal size instrument. The role items were on the first page. Subjects were asked to respond on a seven-point scale with end anchors of "inappropriate," and "appropriate," to,

> A public relations practitioner performs different activities or functions. Many of these are listed below. You may consider some of them more appropriate than others and some of them entirely inappropriate for your position. Please indicate how much you personally (not your management or your clients) consider these activities <u>appropriate or proper</u> for yourself in your present public relations job.

The questionnaire was coded with an identification number to determine non-respondents for a second mailing. Respondents were told, however, that their responses would be confidential, and would not be associated with their name, organization, or position. The questionnaire was precoded to allow keypunching directly from the form. The other three pages of the questionnaire contained role relationship items, professionalism items, communication variables, and various demographic variables.

Two mailings were made. The first on February 26, 1979. The second one, to non-respondents only, was mailed March 13th. Both mailings contained self-addressed stamped envelopes. For this paper, returns were cut off as of March 26th. At that point, 69.6 percent (174) of the questionnaires had been returned. Of these, 19 were from practitioners who had moved, retired, or were no longer in public relations. Sixty-two percent (155) of the returned questionnaires were usable.

Analysis

The 45 role items were submitted to factor analysis. The final solution (after 14 interations) revealed 10 factors with an eigenvalue greater than 1.0, and accounting for 70.2 percent of the variance. Prior to rotation, percent of variance accounted for by unrotated factors was:

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percent of Variance	Cumulative Variance
1	12.48	44.8	44.8
2	4.50	16.2	61.0
3	3.01	10.8	71.8
4	2.07	7.4	79.2
5	1.50	5.4	84.6
6	1.16	4.1	88.7
7	.91	3.3	92.0
8	.81	2.9	94.9
9	.76	2.7	97.6
10	.66	2.4	100.0

Varimax orthogonal rotation was chosen for the terminal solution. Table 1 presents items, means, standard deviations, factor loadings and commonalities (h^2) for the terminal solution. The first factor, as hypothesized, appears to represent a problem solving-management role, but the loadings on the management related variables are moderate (only factor loadings greater than .30 are presented in the interest of parsimony). Specific staff management variables such as managing, training, and recruiting of staff appear to represent a separate role (the fourth factor).

The second factor represents both the hypothesized journalist role and the technical communicator role. Variables loading on this factor include: writing news releases, producing brochures/pamphlets/manuals/handbooks, photography, maintaining media contacts/placing press releases, editing public relations materials, and producing house publications. This factor contained several other technical communication variables, but these variables also have moderate loadings on other factors.

The third factor contains the research-related variables and fairly represented the hypothesized research factor. One anomaly should be noted. The item "scientifically evaluating PR programs" loaded moderately on several factors, as did the item "analyzing current trends."

The fourth factor, as mentioned earlier, represented a staff management role. In addition to managing, training, and recruiting staff, this role also represented variables such as "telling employer what PR unit is doing," and "telling employer's policy decisions to PR staff." This appears to indicate not only a staff management role, but that these practitioners are also a communication link between the public relations unit and management.

The fifth and eight factor represent the hypothesized public-community relations role. But these roles are split. The fifth factor includes the

items "representing employer at special events," and "being employer's good-will ambassador." While the eighth factor includes "developing/maintaining community relations," and "maintaining contact with public officials." The fifth factor would indicate more concern with special events in that there are also moderate loadings on "conducting meetings/conferences," and "acting as your organization's conscience." The eighth factor seems to represent a more active role with moderate loadings on "lobbying for employer," "analyzing current trends," and "telling employer what PR emphasis should be." The fifth factor is labeled "Good-Will Ambassador," and the eighth is called "Public/Community Relations."

The sixth factor includes variables related to meeting organization. Those items loading highly here include: "organizing meetings/special events/ conferences," and "conducting meetings/conferences." Moderately loaded items include: "preparing exhibits/displays/posters/art," and "conducting exhibits/ open houses/slide shows." This was not an hypothesized role. These items were hypothesized to load with the technical communication variables.

The seventh factor represents a personnel-industrial relations role. The items considered most appropriate in this role were those dealing with managing and maintaining personnel/industrial relations. Moderately loaded items were: "producing video cassettes/recordings/slides," and "preparing research proposals for data gathering." This role suggests internal communications-related activities.

Those items loading on the ninth factor were all moderately loaded. They include: "advertising/marketing/sales/sales promotions," "telling employer what PR emphasis should be," "acting as counselor with employer," and "preparing graphics." This factor is suggestive of the hypothesized

Two of the demographic-type variables examined were nominal variables: sex, and whether or not the practitioner worked in a public relations agency. One-way analysis of variance was performed for these two variables (Table 2). Probabilities for the F-ratios are reported in parentheses.

The other eight variables examined were: age; years of experience in public relations, journalism, marketing, advertising, and other fields; salary; and education. Correlations and significance levels (in parentheses) were computed for the relationship between these particular descriptive variables and the composite role variables.

The problem solver-manager role is associated with two of the variables. The more years experience in public relations, and if the practitioner works in an agency, the more likely he is to consider this an appropriate role.

The journalist-technical communicator role is associated with six of the items. The less experience in public relations, the lower the individuals income, the less education, and if the practitioner works in a non-agency organization and is a female, the more likely the journalist-technical communication will be considered the appropriate one.

Only one of the variables is associated with the researcher role; the more experience the practitioner has in other non-communication related fields, the less likely this will be considered an appropriate role. The staff manager role also had only one variable associated with it: salary. The larger the practitioner's income, the more likely the practitioner will consider this an appropriate role.

The good-will ambassador role was associated with several of the variables. The less experience in public relations, the more experience in marketing, the lower the salary, the less education, and if the practitioner works in

advertising marketing factor, but the loadings are low and it will not be used in further analysis. The tenth factor was not interpretable.

Another finding which is of equal interest is the number of variables which do not load highly on any particular factor, or which load across several factors. "Analyzing current trends," and "scientifically evaluating PR programs," are two examples of the latter. "Writing speeches," is an item which does not have significant loadings on any of the factors. The relatively high mean (4.9) would indicate, however, that this is an activity considered appropriate by many practitioners.

Further post hoc analyses were performed using some of the demographic variables. Role research indicates that individuals generally tend to select themselves into roles or positions which are compatible with the person's self (Backman and Second, 1968).[14] Based upon the extensive evidence supporting self-selection into role, it was expected that variables such as age, experience in public relations and other related fields, income, education, sex, and perhaps whether the person works in an agency or in an organization would be related to the type of role they consider appropriate for themselves.

Factor score coefficients were used to compute role variables for the items marked with an asterisk (*) on Table 1. The criterion was that the variable load highly on only one factor. Those with moderate loadings on more than one factor were not used to compute the composite role variables. The variables were standardized prior to being multiplied by the factor score coefficient, then adjusted for the number of variables in that role: Role 1 = (Factor Score * (Variable 1 - $\bar{X}$)/S.D. + ... + (Factor Score * (Variable N - $\bar{X}$)/S.D.)/N.

a non-agency organization, and is a female, the more likely this is to be considered an appropriate role. The meeting organizer role is associated with being a female, having less experience in public relations, lower salaries, and low levels of education.

The personnel-industrial relations role is associated with high levels of education. Finally, the last role examined, the public community relations role is more likely to be thought appropriate by older practitioners, those with more marketing experience, and those with lower salary levels.

Caution should be exercised with these correlations, however. Only two were .25 or greater, so the proportion of shared variance, although significant, is fairly small for most of the variables. That is, the association is systematic, but not markedly so.

Discussion

These data lend support to the argument that the practice of public relations is becoming even more specialized than many suspect. If the degree of specialization were still quite broad and covered a large set of activities we would have expected to find only a couple of factors emerging. These findings indicate that the most important role--important in the sense that it explains the largest proportion of variance in the data--is the problem solving one. The traditional journalist-technical communicator role, however, is apparently considered appropriate by many practitioners in that is was the second factor emerging. The third role was not, however, expected to play such an important part in terms of explaining the variance in the data. This research role may well be emerging as generally appropriate for a fair sub-set of practitioners.

The split of the staff management activities from more general problem-solving activities was one of the other surprises in these data. Apparently practitioners who engage in staff management do not generally also see the problem-solving activities as part of this role. The experienced practitioner has a different view, however. He tends to see problem-solving behaviors as appropriate, and journalist-technical communicator, good-will ambassador, and meeting organizer activities as inappropriate, as least for himself.

But, these are not necessarily the practitioners who make the largest salaries. The best paid practitioners believe the behaviors appropriate for themselves are staff management activities. It may well be that these practitioners also are involved in organizational personnel activities, and what we commonly consider public relations activities are at best secondary to their positions. While this cannot be determined without further study, it would explain the fairly strong association between income and the staff management role.

These findings have some interesting implications. If practitioners are beginning to specialize in these or similar roles, then those who are planning careers in public relations should give some consideration to which role they intend to engage in. A problem solving role requires different skills and knowledge from the journalist-technical communicator role. The same could be argued for the researcher role and the staff manager role.

If a public relations student's goals were agency work, he would probably want to gain skills which would allow him to effectively develop, plan, and analyze public relations programs. Journalism schools also may want to note this type of evolution in a profession which has been strongly associated with traditional journalism skills. The course work required for a public relations degree may need to reflect several of the potential areas of specialization. Or, given the generally limited resources

of academic institutions, different educational institutions may find it necessary to limit their public relations program to a particular area of specialization. For example, it would seem that currently there are institutions which might be better equiped to train students as public relations researchers, while yet other institutions would seem to have faculty and resources which would allow students to develop problem-solving management abilities, or journalist-technical communicator skills.

As with most studies, these data raise many more questions than they answer. It would be useful to learn whether clients or employers view the these practitioner's with the same types of specialization. One suspects from the complaints voiced by practitioners that there is often not a great deal of agreement between what the practitioner believes he should do and what his employer or client wants him to do. This same technique could be used to examine the question of whether the practitioner's actual behaviors are consistent with his norms. The job satisfaction literature would lead us to predict that if the distance between what the practitioners actually does, and the norms he holds for himself, or the norms others hold for him is great, high levels of dissatisfaction would result.

Other questions generated by these findings include: how are these particular roles associated with professional attitudes? Would we find that those practitioners with the most professional attitudes are also those practitioners who think they should be engaging in the problem-solving management activities? What about the relationship between the practitioner and his employer--do practitioners who perceive the relationship as a highly positive one see their public relations roles differently? In addition, how does the size of the organization, budget, and number of staff member relate to the role the practitioner considers appropriate. We would expect the

size of the organization to be directly related to the staff manager role, and the personnel-industrial relations role. Also. we should explore possible hypotheses for the split of the good-will ambassador role and the public-community relations role. Is this some sort of ideological split that separates the practitioner who engages in lobbying and maintaining public and community relations from the practitioner who sees his role as representative and good-will ambassador, or is this split associated with the type of organization the practitioner works for?

The data collected in this survey will be used to explore some of these questions later. However, these roles need to replicated in future studies before they can be considered anything but suggestive of the type of specialization which may be occuring in the practice of public relations. The size of the sample (250) precludes making strong generalizations, but the relatively high rate of return (more than 70 percent after all the questionnaires were returned) reduces some of these cautions. There is no attempt being made to generalize these data beyond members of the Public Relations Society of America. It is likely, however, that these are highly professional practitioners, and as such they may be more inclined to engage in problem solving activities than other practitioners. Replication with non-PRSA members would add to the validity and generalizability of these roles.

As a final caution, it should be noted that no attempt is being made to indicate causality. Salary may well precede the type of role a practitioner engages in, or the direction may be reversed; adopting a role may lead to a particular salary level. The same argument may be made for working in an agency. These causality questions will require another approach besides a one-time survey.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Milton S. Baker, Jr., "The Image Makers' Image," Public Relations Journal, August, (1977), pp. 18-19, Allen H. Center, "Canvassing the Calling," Public Relations Journal, November, (1977), pp. 40, 41, 46., "Surveys Indicate Different PR Habits," IABC News, January (1978), 7 (7), p. 6.

[2]Center, p. 41.

[3]John W. Hill, "The World of Tomorrow, " Public Relations Journal, October, (1976).

[4]R. Linton, The Study of Man, New York: Appleton-Century, 1936.

[5]J. A. Jackson, (ed.), Role, Cambridge University Press, 1972.

[6]W. Coutu, "Role Playing VS Role Taking: An Appeal for Clarification," American Sociological Review, April (1951), pp. 180-187.

[7]T. Parsons, The Structure of Social Action, Glencce, Illincis: The Free Press, 1951.

[8]R. H. Turner, "Role-Taking, Role Standpoint, and Reference-Group Behavior," American Journal of Sociology, 61 (1956), pp. 316-328.

[9]H. Popitz, "The Concept of Social Role as an Element in Sociological Theory," In Role (ed.) J. A. Jackson, Cambridge University Press, 1972.

[10]Rex F. Harlow, "Building a Public Relations Definition, " Public Relations Review, Winter (1976), 2 (4), pp. 34-42.

[11]Otto Lerbinger, "Corporate Use of Research in Public Relations," Public Relations Review, Winter (1977), 3 (4), pp. 11-19.

[12]Scott M. Cutlip and Allen H. Center, Effective Public Relations, 5th ed., Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1978.

[13]"Chit Chat Declining, Profession Booming," IABC News, July, (1977) 7 (1), pp. 1, 5. Special thanks is given to the Communication Research Center at the S.I. Newhouse School of Public Communication for providing these data for secondary analysis.

[14]Carl W. Backman and Paul F. Second, "The Self and Role Selection," in The Self in Social Interaction, C. Gordon and K.J. Gergen, (eds.) Vol. 1 New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1968., pp. 289-296.

Table 1.

Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Loadings For Role Items

	Questionnaire Items	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	h^2
Problem Solver-Manager	Assessing/evaluating alternative PR solutions	6.2	1.3	.84*										.77
	Analyzing facts about a PR problem or program	6.1	1.4	.79*										.72
	Planning PR programs	6.4	1.2	.72*										.65
	Developing alternative PR solutions	5.8	1.5	.71*										.71
	Developing long-range goals for PR unit	5.9	1.7	.63			.42							.78
	Telling employer what PR emphasis should be	5.9	1.7	.57							.31	.46		.80
	Daily managing specific PR programs	6.0	1.7	.53	.44									.56
	Telling employer what PR unit is doing	5.5	2.1	.51			.37							.59
Journalist Technical-Communicator	Writing news releases	5.5	2.0		.84*									.86
	Producing brochures/pamphlets/manuals/handbooks	5.0	2.0		.75*									.68
	Photography	3.9	2.1		.66*									.50
	Maintaining media contacts/placing press releases	6.0	1.7	.30	.65*									.65
	Editing public relations materials	5.6	1.7		.65*									.54
	Producing house publications	4.5	2.4		.61*									.47
	Preparing exhibits/displays/posters/art	3.7	2.2		.64				.39					.62
	Preparing graphics	3.4	2.1		.62							.34		.67
	Producing video cassettes/recordings/slides	3.9	2.2		.62					.37				.61
	Conducting exhibits/open houses/slide shows	4.1	2.1		.60				.36					.60
Researcher	Conducting opinion research surveys	3.5	2.1			.71*								.72
	Undertaking scientific research	3.0	2.1			.71*								.57
	Systematic fact-finding	4.4	2.0			.67*								.53
	Conducting communication audits	3.7	2.2			.63*								.63
	Preparing research proposals for data gathering	3.0	1.9			.59				.33				.61
Staff Manager	Managing PR unit staff	5.0	2.4	.30			.87*							.91
	Training PR unit staff in public relations	4.8	2.4	.32			.80*							.83
	Recruiting staff for PR unit	4.4	2.4	.33			.76*							.77
	Telling employer's policy decisions to PR staff	4.7	2.4	.38			.64							.65
Good-will Ambassador	Representing employer at special events	5.1	1.9					.66*						.66
	Being employer's good-will ambassador	5.1	2.1					.64*						.58
Meeting Organizer	Organizing meetings/special events/conferences	5.2	1.8						.65*					.61
	Conducting meetings/conferences	5.0	1.9			.32		.30	.49*					.50
Personnel-Industrial Relations	Managing personnel/industrial relations	2.5	1.9							.76*				.68
	Maintaining personnel/industrial relations	3.3	2.1				.34			.56*				.59
Public-Community Relations	Developing/maintaining community relations	5.1	2.0								.73*			.72
	Maintaining contact with public officials	4.7	2.0								.72*			.68
	Advertising/marketing/sales/sales promotion	3.8	2.2									.53		.37
	Telling employer what public wants	5.5	1.9	.49									.63	.82
	Preparing annual reports/financial reports	4.5	2.4										.38	.33
	Identifying potential or actual audiences	5.9	1.6	.44		.31								.41
	Acting as counselor with employer	5.9	1.8	.40								.40		.47
	Analyzing current trends	4.9	1.9	.40		.39					.34			.67
	Scientifically evaluating PR programs	4.5	2.2	.31		.42	.47							.62
	Writing speeches	4.9	1.9											.42
	Acting as your organization's conscience	5.3	1.8	.32				.33						.43
	Lobbying for employer	3.2	2.2								.34			.35

Table 2.

Relationship Between Public Relations Roles and Other Descriptive Variables

	Problem Solver-Manager	Journalist Technical-Communicator	Researcher	Staff Manager	Good-Will Ambassador	Meeting Organizer	Personnel-Industrial Relations	Public-Community Relations
	GROUP MEANS FOR STANDARDIZED ROLE VARIABLES							
Work in an agency:								
Yes (N = 35)	.049	-.040	.045	-.002	-.138	-.053	-.054	-.119
No (N = 119)	-.029	.014	-.017	-.009	.029	.001	.018	.063
Probability[a]	(.063)	(.034)			(.003)			
Sex:								
Male (N = 105)	-.023	-.016	-.010	-.002	-.044	-.064	-.011	-.005
Female (N = 50)	.015	.037	.013	-.018	.063	.095	.028	.081
Probability[a]		(.021)			(.038)	(.002)		
	CORRELATIONS FOR STANDARDIZED ROLE VARIABLES WITH DESCRIPTIVE VARIABLES[b]							
Age								.16 (.026)
Years in:								
Public Relations	.13 (.055)	-.19 (.011)			-.14 (.048)	-.20 (.007)		
Journalism								
Marketing					.19 (.011)			.16 (.027)
Advertising								
Other Fields			-.13 (.057)					
Salary		-.47 (.001)		.18 (.015)	-.18 (.016)	-.14 (.041)		-.25 (.001)
Education		-.24 (.002)			-.14 (.038)	-.18 (.016)	.17 (.020)	

[a]Probabilities for One Way Analysis of Variance F-Ratios

[b]Pearson Product Moment Correlation Level of Significance